

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

EMIL P. MILYAKOV and MAGDALENA A.
APOSTOLOVA,

No. C 11-02066 WHA

Plaintiffs,

v.

JP MORGAN CHASE, N.A., HSBC BANK
USA, NA, CALIFORNIA RECONVEYANCE
CO., PAUL FINANCIAL, LLC, MORTGAGE
ELECTRONIC REGISTRATION SYSTEMS,
INC. (MERS), FOUNDATION
CONVEYANCING, LLC, and DOES 1
through 100,

Defendants.

**ORDER ON MOTION TO SHORTEN
TIME FOR MOTION TO REMAND,
OR ALTERNATIVELY, CONTINUE
HEARING ON MOTION FOR
SUMMARY JUDGMENT**

Plaintiffs filed a motion to shorten time on the motion to remand, or in the alternative, to continue the hearing on the motion for summary judgment (Dkt. No. 60). Defendants did not stipulate to the motion. Plaintiffs seek to have the motion to remand heard on an expedited basis so that the Court can address the remand issue prior to ruling on other pending motions. Plaintiffs articulate no other reason for seeking to have the motion to remand heard on an expedited basis.


By order dated November 1, 2011, the Court consolidated the hearings on plaintiffs' motion to remand, motion for leave to file a second amended complaint, and defendants' motion for summary judgment (Dkt. No. 59). All three motions are scheduled to be heard at 2 p.m. on December 1. If the Court grants the motion to remand, no further action will be taken on the

1 pending motions. The order finds no basis for shortening time, as plaintiffs' only reason for
2 shortening time is already addressed by the consolidation of the above-mentioned hearings.

3 Thus, the motion to shorten time is **DENIED**. The motion to continue the hearing on the
4 summary judgment motion is **DENIED AS MOOT**.

5
6 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

7
8 Dated: November 7, 2011.



9 WILLIAM ALSUP
10 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28